

## JOHNSON'S ACTIONS THREATEN SENIORS

**Wisconsin State Journal: "Ron Johnson Encourages Seniors To Rejoin The Workforce"**  
[Wisconsin State Journal, [9/03/22](#)]

## JOHNSON VOTED TO CUT SOCIAL SECURITY

## JOHNSON VOTED REPEATEDLY TO CUT SOCIAL SECURITY

## JOHNSON VOTED FOR CUT, CAP AND BALANCE PLAN WHICH WOULD FORCE DEEP CUTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

**Johnson Voted For A Bill To Make The Debt Limit Increase Contingent On Setting And Enforcing Statutory Spending Gaps As A Percentage Of GDP In FY 2012-FY 2021.** In July 2011, Johnson voted against a: "Reid, D-Nev., motion to table (kill) the Reid motion to proceed to the bill that would make an increase in the debt limit contingent upon the passage of a balanced-budget constitutional amendment. The bill also would set fiscal 2012 discretionary spending at \$1.019 trillion and enforce statutory caps that limit spending as a percentage of gross domestic product in fiscal 2012 through 2021." The motion to table failed 51-46. [CQ, [7/22/11](#); H.R. 2560, Vote 116, [7/22/11](#)]

- **The Bill Was The "Cut, Cap, And Balance Act Of 2011."** [H.R. 2560, Introduced [7/15/11](#)]
- **CBPP: Cut, Cap And Balance Bill "Would Necessitate Deep Cuts" To Social Security And Medicare, "Big Cuts" To Social Security And Medicare Would Be "Inevitable."** "The legislation would inexorably subject Social Security and Medicare to deep reductions. The measure does not cut Social Security or Medicare in 2012. And it does not subject them to automatic cuts if its global spending caps are missed. It is inconceivable, however, that policymakers would meet the bill's severe annual spending caps through automatic across-the-board cuts year after year; if they did, key government functions would be crippled. Policymakers would have little alternative but to institute deep cuts in specific programs. And as noted elsewhere in this statement, before the debt limit could be raised, Congress would have to approve a constitutional balanced budget amendment that essentially requires cuts even deeper than those in the Ryan budget. Reaching and maintaining a balanced budget in the decade ahead while barring any tax increases would necessitate deep cuts in Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. After all, by 2021, total expenditures for these three programs will be nearly 45 percent greater than expenditures for all other programs (except interest payments) combined. Big cuts in these programs would be inevitable." [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, [7/16/11](#)]
- **CBPP: Cut, Cap, And Balance "One Of The Most Ideologically Extreme Pieces Of Major Budget Legislation To Come Before Congress In Years."** "The 'Cut, Cap, and Balance Act' that the House of Representatives will vote on next week stands out as one of the most ideologically extreme pieces of major budget legislation to come before Congress in years, if not decades. It would go a substantial way toward enshrining Grover Norquist's version of America into law." [Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, [7/16/11](#)]

- **Center For American Progress: Cut, Cap, Balance Means “Simply Massive Cuts” To Social Security And Medicare.** “There is no way around the basic arithmetic. The only way to achieve that level of spending is by radically altering some fundamental public programs and services. A federal spending cap may sound innocuous but it is simply massive cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid by another name.” [Center for American Progress, [7/18/11](#)]
- **The National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare: Cut, Cap and Balance “Would Require Draconian Spending Cuts of Such a Magnitude As To Force Policymakers To Severely Slash Medicare, Medicaid, And Many Other Programs While Opening The Door To Massive New Tax Cuts.”** According to The National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare: “As a result, these proposals would require draconian spending cuts of such a magnitude as to force policymakers to severely slash Medicare, Medicaid, and many other programs while opening the door to massive new tax cuts. What is most alarming to our members is that the amendment would negatively impact Social Security by essentially nullifying the trust funds as a source of funding for the payment of benefits.” [National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, [7/18/11](#)]
- **AARP Opposed Cut, Cap And Balance Because It Did Not Shield Social Security and Medicare From “Arbitrary Reductions.”** “In addition, the Cut, Cap and Balance Act requires that a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution be transmitted to the states as a pre-condition of increasing the debt ceiling. Social Security and Medicare, which are not excluded under the balanced budget amendment, would therefore be at risk for arbitrary reductions under the constitutional amendment, and as such, AARP is opposed.” [AARP Letter, [7/21/11](#)]

#### **JOHNSON VOTED FOR BUDGET PLAN THAT WOULD CUT SOCIAL SECURITY BY RAISING THE ELIGIBILITY AGE**

**Johnson Voted For The FY 2014 Paul Budget That Raised The Social Security Eligibility Age From 65 To 70.** In March 2013, Johnson voted for: Paul, R-Ky., substitute amendment no. 263 that would call for a balanced budget in five years with no revenue increases. It would allow up to \$942.6 billion in discretionary spending for fiscal 2014, including \$529.2 billion for defense. It would assume repeal of the 2010 health care and financial regulatory overhaul laws and assume a tax code overhaul that would eliminate the estate and capital gains taxes and switch to a flat tax system. It would assume changes to Medicare to provide seniors the same health insurance as members of Congress and assume a gradual increase in the eligibility age for Social Security from 65 to 70 over 20 years. It also would assume the elimination of the Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Education and Energy departments.” The amendment was rejected 18-81. [CQ, [3/22/13](#); S.Amdt.263 to S.Con.Res. 8, Vote 69, [3/22/13](#)]

#### **JOHNSON VOTED FOR A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT, WHICH WOULD WEAKEN SOCIAL SECURITY**

**February 2015: Johnson Was An Original Cosponsor Of A Joint Resolution To Propose A Balanced Budget Amendment.** On February 4, 2015, Johnson became an original cosponsor on “a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.” The bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary on March 16, 2016. [CQ, [2/4/15](#); S.J.Res.6, Introduced 2/4/15, Cosponsored [2/4/15](#)]

- May 2016: The Center For Budget And Policy Priorities Projected That The Balanced Budget Amendment Supported By Republicans Would Result In \$2.3 Trillion Cut From Social Security Over Ten Years.** “This cap would compel policymakers to cut all programs by an average of more than one-fourth when it takes effect — we are assuming 2023. The total amount of cuts required would amount to \$8 trillion over the next decade; starting in 2023, the cuts would be about half a trillion dollars a year deeper than those that would be made under the severe budget plan the House Budget Committee’s Republican majority passed earlier this year. If the cuts required by the Senate Republican BBA proposal were made equally across all programs, Social Security would be cut \$2.3 trillion over the ten-year period, and defense would be cut more than \$1 trillion on top of the cuts that have already occurred and are scheduled to occur as a result of the 2011 Budget Control Act’s annual funding caps and sequestration. As a result, defense spending would fall by 2026 to its lowest level as a percent of the economy since 1940, before the United States entered World War II.” [Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, [5/3/16](#)]

## **JOHNSON SAID CUTTING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS SHOULD BE “ON THE TABLE”**

**Johnson Said To Solve Social Security, Upping The Payroll Tax, Cutting Benefits, Raising The Retirement Age Should “All” Be “On The Table.”** “U.S. Sen. Ron Johnson, a Republican from Oshkosh, met Monday with the Leader-Telegram Editorial Board and fielded questions on several topics. Following are edited versions of some of his responses: [...] Q: How do you address the long-term Social Security solvency issue without upping the payroll tax, cutting benefits or raising the retirement age? A: You can put all those things on the table. It’s actually actuarially pretty easy to do. It’s just a matter of how you tweak it. ... You can actually do these things by increasing the retirement age. We have to recognize that when Social Security was first enacted the retirement age was set at 65 and life expectancy was 62. Now there’s a long-term program that’s solvent. But the average life expectancy now is just shy of 80 years. You have to recognize that our population is just growing older. These programs -- it’s not ideology; it’s math. For Medicare, for example, the most recent study I saw showed someone retiring today at age of 65 will have paid about \$110,000. The problem is that same individual is expected to pull out about \$350,000 in benefits.” [Eau Claire Leader-Telegram, [8/30/11](#)]

## **JOHNSON VOTED TO RAISE THE SOCIAL SECURITY ELIGIBILITY AGE**

**Johnson Voted For The FY 2014 Paul Budget That Raised The Social Security Eligibility Age From 65 To 70.** In March 2013, Johnson voted for: Paul, R-Ky., substitute amendment no. 263 that would call for a balanced budget in five years with no revenue increases. It would allow up to \$942.6 billion in discretionary spending for fiscal 2014, including \$529.2 billion for defense. It would assume repeal of the 2010 health care and financial regulatory overhaul laws and assume a tax code overhaul that would eliminate the estate and capital gains taxes and switch to a flat tax system. It would assume changes to Medicare to provide seniors the same health insurance as members of Congress and assume a gradual increase in the eligibility age for Social Security from 65 to 70 over 20 years. It also would assume the elimination of the Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Education and Energy departments.” The amendment was rejected 18-81. [CQ, [3/22/13](#); S.Amdt.263 to S.Con.Res. 8, Vote 69, [3/22/13](#)]

**Johnson Said Raising The Retirement Age Was “Not Ideology; It’s Math” And “You Have To Recognize That Our Population Is Just Growing Older.”** “U.S. Sen. Ron Johnson, a

Republican from Oshkosh, met Monday with the Leader-Telegram Editorial Board and fielded questions on several topics. Following are edited versions of some of his responses: [...] Q: How do you address the long-term Social Security solvency issue without upping the payroll tax, cutting benefits or raising the retirement age? A: [...] You can actually do these things by increasing the retirement age. We have to recognize that when Social Security was first enacted the retirement age was set at 65 and life expectancy was 62. Now there's a long-term program that's solvent. But the average life expectancy now is just shy of 80 years. You have to recognize that our population is just growing older. These programs -- it's not ideology; it's math. For Medicare, for example, the most recent study I saw showed someone retiring today at age of 65 will have paid about \$110,000. The problem is that same individual is expected to pull out about \$350,000 in benefits." [Eau Claire Leader-Telegram, [8/30/11](#)]

## JOHNSON VOTED TO CUT MEDICARE

### JOHNSON VOTED FOR GOP BUDGETS THAT WOULD CUT MEDICARE BY OVER \$430 BILLION

#### *VOTED SIX TIMES TO CUT MEDICARE BY OVER \$430 BILLION*

**2017: Johnson Voted For The GOP FY 2018 Budget Resolution, Which Started The Process Towards Tax Reform And Called For Cutting Medicare By \$473 Billion.** In October 2017, Johnson voted for a budget resolution that would have, according to The Hill, "The spending blueprint is key to Republicans' efforts to pass tax reform because it includes instructions that will allow the plan to avoid a Democratic filibuster. [...] The budget, meant to outline spending for the fiscal year, was widely viewed as a mere vehicle for passing tax reform. [...] The budget would allow the Senate GOP's tax plan to add up to \$1.5 trillion to the deficit over a decade, a proposal that has raised concerns with fiscal hawks in the GOP. Its instructions call for the Senate Finance Committee to report a tax bill by Nov. 13. Still, the document outlines the Senate GOP's political vision. It maintains spending at 2017 levels for the year, but would then cut nondefense spending in subsequent years, leading to a \$106 billion cut in 2027. It would also allow defense levels to continue rising at their current rates, reaching \$684 billion at the end of a decade. The resolution also proposes \$473 billion in cuts to Medicare's baseline spending over a decade and about \$1 trillion from Medicaid, though those provisions are not enforceable without additional legislation." The vote was on passage. The Senate agreed to the budget by a vote of 51 to 49. The House later passed the budget resolution. [Senate Vote 245, [10/19/17](#); The Hill, [10/19/17](#); Congressional Actions, [H. Con. Res. 71](#)]

**2017: Johnson Voted For \$473 Billion In Medicare Cuts.** In October 2017, Johnson voted against an amendment that would have eliminated the \$473 billion in Medicare cuts found in the underlying budget resolution. According to a floor speech by Sen. Nelson (D-FL), "Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, before Medicare, one-half of senior citizens in this country did not have any healthcare, health insurance. Medicare changed that. So why in the world would we want to cut \$473 billion from Medicare? It does not make sense. My amendment simply restores that cut and replaces it with eliminating a number of tax loopholes. It is a simple amendment. Save Medicare." The underlying legislation was the FY 2018 Senate budget resolution that set up reconciliation instructions for tax reform. The vote was on the amendment. The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 47 to 51. [Senate Vote 222, [10/18/17](#); Congressional Record, [10/18/17](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 1150](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 1116](#); Congressional Actions, [H. Con. Res. 71](#)]

**2017: Johnson Effectively Voted For The GOP FY 2018 Budget Resolution, Which Started The Process Towards Tax Reform And Called For Cutting Medicare By \$473 Billion.** In October 2017, Johnson effectively voted for a budget resolution that would have, according to The Hill, “The spending blueprint is key to Republicans’ efforts to pass tax reform because it includes instructions that will allow the plan to avoid a Democratic filibuster. [...] The budget, meant to outline spending for the fiscal year, was widely viewed as a mere vehicle for passing tax reform. [...] The budget would allow the Senate GOP’s tax plan to add up to \$1.5 trillion to the deficit over a decade, a proposal that has raised concerns with fiscal hawks in the GOP. Its instructions call for the Senate Finance Committee to report a tax bill by Nov. 13. Still, the document outlines the Senate GOP’s political vision. It maintains spending at 2017 levels for the year, but would then cut nondefense spending in subsequent years, leading to a \$106 billion cut in 2027. It would also allow defense levels to continue rising at their current rates, reaching \$684 billion at the end of a decade. The resolution also proposes \$473 billion in cuts to Medicare’s baseline spending over a decade and about \$1 trillion from Medicaid, though those provisions are not enforceable without additional legislation.” The vote was on a motion to invoke cloture on the House GOP budget resolution, setting up a vote on the Senate’s budget resolution. The Senate agreed to the motion by a vote of 50 to 47 The House and the Senate later passed a slightly different version of the budget resolution. [Senate Vote 219, [10/17/17](#); The Hill, [10/19/17](#); Congressional Actions, [H. Con. Res. 71](#)]

**2015: Johnson Voted To Make \$430 Billion In Unexplained Cuts To Medicare, As Part Of The FY 2016 Conference Report Budget Resolution.** In May 2015, Johnson voted for the FY 2016 conference report budget resolution which, according to the Congressional Conference Report, “The agreement proposes the same amount of Medicare savings reflected in the Senate-passed fiscal year 2016 budget as a target to extend the life of the Hospital Insurance trust fund and tasks the committees of jurisdiction in the House and Senate with determining the specific Medicare reforms needed to bring spending levels under current law in line with the budget.” According to Bloomberg, the Senate’s original budget, “avoided a plan to partially privatize Medicare that the U.S. House of Representatives embraced in its budget [and] instead call[ed] for \$430 billion in spending cuts without explaining where they would be made.” The vote was on the Conference Report; the Conference Report, which also passed the House, was passed by a vote of 51 to 48. [Senate Vote 171, [5/5/15](#); Conference Report, [4/29/15](#); Bloomberg, [3/27/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 11](#)]

**2015: Johnson Voted To Make \$430 Billion In Unexplained Cuts To Medicare, As Part Of The Senate’s FY 2016 Budget Resolution.** In March 2015, Johnson voted for the Senate’s FY 2016 budget resolution, which, according to Bloomberg, “avoided a plan to partially privatize Medicare that the U.S. House of Representatives embraced in its budget [and] instead call[ed] for \$430 billion in spending cuts without explaining where they would be made.” The Senate adopted the budget resolution by a vote of 52 to 46. A final budget resolution included the same unspecified cuts to Medicare. [Senate Vote 135, [3/27/15](#); Bloomberg, [3/27/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [4/30/15](#); S. Con. Res. 11, [4/7/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 11](#)]

**2015: Johnson Voted Against Restoring Roughly \$430 Billion In Unexplained Medicare Cuts In Senate Republicans’ FY 2016 Budget.** In March 2015, Johnson voted against an amendment to the Senate’s FY 2016 budget resolution that, according to Sen Debbie Stabenow (D-MI) in the Congressional Record, would have “reject[ed] the \$435 billion in Medicare cuts that are in this budget resolution.” The amendment was rejected by a vote of 46 to 54. [Senate Vote 111, [3/26/15](#); Congressional Record, [3/26/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 1072](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 11](#)]

## **JOHNSON BACKED RYAN BUDGETS THAT WOULD HAVE RAISED COSTS FOR SENIORS**

**Johnson Voted Three Times For Ryan Budgets Which The CBO Found Would Have Drastically Increased Out-Of-Pocket Costs For Seniors And Would End Medicare As We Know It.** “Johnson voted for a budget plan that called for privatizing Medicare. Johnson voted three times, in 2011, 2012 and 2013, for budget blueprints put forth by U.S. House Speaker Paul Ryan, R-Janesville, who at that time was House Budget Committee chairman. The budgets called for transforming Medicare into a voucher program. Under that model, seniors would receive a fixed subsidy to help pay for private health care coverage. The Medicare eligibility age also would have increased from 65 to 67 under the proposal. An analysis by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found the move would drastically increase out-of-pocket health care costs for seniors.” [Wisconsin State Journal, [10/30/16](#)]

- **Johnson Voted For The FY 2014 Ryan Budget Plan.** [CQ, [3/21/13](#); S.Amdt. 433 to S.Con.Res. 8, Vote 46, [3/21/13](#)]
- **Johnson Voted For The FY 2013 Ryan Budget Plan.** [CQ, [5/16/12](#); H.Con.Res. 112, Vote 98, [5/16/12](#)]
- **Johnson Voted For The FY 2012 Ryan Budget Plan.** [Washington Post, [5/25/11](#); H.Con.Res. 34, Vote 77, [5/25/11](#)]

**CBPP Analysis: The Ryan Budget Would “Shift Substantial Costs To Medicare Beneficiaries.”** “The Medicare proposals in the 2014 budget resolution developed by House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-WI) are essentially the same as those in last year’s Ryan budget. Once again, Chairman Ryan proposes to replace Medicare’s guarantee of health coverage with a premium-support voucher and raise the age of eligibility for Medicare from 65 to 67. Together, these changes would shift substantial costs to Medicare beneficiaries and (with the simultaneous repeal of health reform) leave many 65- and 66-year-olds without any health coverage. The Ryan budget would cut Medicare spending by \$356 billion over the 2013 - 2023 period compared to CBPP’s current-policy baseline. It would save \$129 billion by repealing the Medicare benefit improvements in health reform (including closure of the prescription drug ‘donut hole’), limiting medical malpractice awards, and raising income-tested premiums. Ryan’s budget also includes \$138 billion in scheduled cuts from Medicare’s sustainable growth rate formula for physicians and \$89 billion in Medicare cuts from sequestration.” [Center On Budget And Policy Priorities, [3/15/13](#)]

**CBPP: Under The Ryan Budget, “Over Time, Seniors Would Have To Pay More To Keep The Health Plans And Doctors They Like, Or They Would Get Fewer Benefits.”** “Since under the Ryan budget, Medicare would no longer make payments to health care providers such as doctors and hospitals, the only way to keep Medicare cost growth within the target of GDP growth plus one-half percentage point would be to limit the annual increase in the amount of the premium-support vouchers. As a result, the vouchers would purchase less coverage with each passing year, pushing more costs on to beneficiaries. Over time, seniors would have to pay more to keep the health plans and the doctors they like, or they would get fewer benefits.” [Center On Budget And Policy Priorities, [3/15/13](#)]

**JOHNSON VOTED TO BLOCK MEDICARE FROM NEGOTIATING FOR LOWER DRUG PRICES AND TO STOP A CAP ON OUT OF POCKET DRUG COSTS FOR SENIORS**

**Johnson Voted Against The Inflation Reduction Act.** In August 2022, Johnson voted against the Inflation Reduction Act. [Senate Vote 325, [8/07/22](#)]

- **Kaiser Health News: Inflation Reduction Act “Will Have A Major Impact On Medicare, Including By Allowing The Program To Negotiate Drug Prices For Some Of The Most Expensive Drugs, Capping Beneficiaries’ Out-Of-Pocket Payments For Drugs.”** “The bill will also have a major impact on Medicare, including by allowing the program to negotiate prices for some of the most expensive drugs, capping beneficiaries’ out-of-pocket payments for drugs, limiting their insulin cost sharing to \$35 a month, and barring drug companies from raising prices faster than inflation.” [Kaiser Health News, [8/12/22](#)]
- **Johnson Previously Voted To Block Consideration Of The Inflation Reduction Act.** In August 2022, Johnson voted to block consideration of the Inflation Reduction Act. ABC News reported: “Senate Democrats passed their first procedural vote on the Inflation Reduction Act on Saturday. The motion to proceed on the \$739 billion climate, tax and health care bill passed in a 51 to 50 vote. Vice President Kamala Harris cast the tie-breaking vote.” [ABC news, [8/06/22](#); Senate Vote 287, [8/06/22](#)]

**Senator Ron Johnson Voted Against A Resolution That Introduced A Framework For Biden’s Budget Reconciliation Bill, Which Biden Planned To Use As A Legislative Vehicle For Build Back Better.** On August 11, 2021, Senator Ron Johnson Voted Against: “Agreeing to the fiscal 2022 budget resolution, as amended, that would set annual budgetary levels for federal revenues, new budget authority, outlays, deficits and public debt for fiscal years 2022 through 2031, including to outline annual levels of new budget authority and outlays for each of the 20 major budget function categories and separate levels for administrative expenses related to the Social Security Administration and U.S. Postal Service. The concurrent resolution would direct 12 Senate committees and 13 House committees to make recommendations within their respective jurisdictions for budget reconciliation legislation that combined could increase the deficit through fiscal 2031 by up to nearly \$1.75 trillion, intended to set up a \$3.5 trillion reconciliation package to enact priorities of President Joe Biden’s “Build Back Better” plan, including universal prekindergarten; tuition-free community college; Medicare expansion; affordable housing support; establishment of a civilian climate corps; clean energy incentives; and a pathway to citizenship for immigrants.” The resolution was passed by a vote of 50-49. [CQ, [8/11/21](#); S. Con. Res. 14, Vote 357, [8/11/21](#)]

- **The Build Back Better Plan Allowed For The Cost Negotiation Of Prescription Drugs Under Medicare.** “Specifically, the plan will: Finally let Medicare negotiate drug prices. Medicare will negotiate prices for high-cost prescription drugs. This will include drugs seniors get at the pharmacy counter (through Medicare Part D), and drugs that are administered in a doctor’s office (through Medicare Part B). Drugs become eligible for negotiation once they have been on the market for a fixed number of years: 9 years for small molecule drugs and 12 years for biologics. Medicare will negotiate up to 10 drugs per year during 2023, with those prices taking effect in 2025, increasing to up to 20 drugs per year.” [White House, [11/2/22](#)]

- **The Build Back Better Plan Would Include Both Prescription And Over-The-Counter Drugs To Be Eligible For Cost Negotiation.** “Specifically, the plan will: Finally let Medicare negotiate drug prices. Medicare will negotiate prices for high-cost prescription drugs. This will include drugs seniors get at the pharmacy counter (through Medicare Part D), and drugs that are administered in a doctor’s office (through Medicare Part B). Drugs become eligible for negotiation once they have been on the market for a fixed number of years: 9 years for small molecule drugs and 12 years for biologics. Medicare will negotiate up to 10 drugs per year during 2023, with those prices taking effect in 2025, increasing to up to 20 drugs per year.” [White House, [11/2/22](#)]
- **The Build Back Better Plan Would Allow Drugs To Become Eligible For Price Negotiation Once A Drug Had Been On The Market For A Fixed Amount Of Time.** “Specifically, the plan will: Finally let Medicare negotiate drug prices. Medicare will negotiate prices for high-cost prescription drugs. This will include drugs seniors get at the pharmacy counter (through Medicare Part D), and drugs that are administered in a doctor’s office (through Medicare Part B). Drugs become eligible for negotiation once they have been on the market for a fixed number of years: 9 years for small molecule drugs and 12 years for biologics. Medicare will negotiate up to 10 drugs per year during 2023, with those prices taking effect in 2025, increasing to up to 20 drugs per year.” [White House, [11/2/22](#)]

**JOHNSON SAID HEALTH CARE IS “MORE OF A PRIVILEGE,” TOOK \$600,000 FROM THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY AND VOTED TO ALLOW THEM TO CHARGE PEOPLE MORE FOR HAVING PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS**

**JOHNSON CALLED HEALTH CARE “MORE OF A PRIVILEGE”**

**When Asked If Healthcare Was A Right Or A Privilege, Johnson Said, “I Think It’s Probably More Of A Privilege.”** “Wisconsin Sen. Ron Johnson on Friday morning told a group of high school students that they don’t have a right to health care, food and shelter. The Republican’s statement in the auditorium at New Berlin West High School was in response to a question posed during a forum with students interested in politics, journalism and government. ‘Do you personally consider healthcare as a privilege or a right?’ one student inquired. Wisconsin’s senior senator did not hesitate: ‘I think it’s probably more of a privilege.’ He continued: ‘Do you consider food a right? Do you consider clothing a right? Do you consider shelter a right? What we have as rights is life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Past that point, we have the right to freedom. Past that point is a limited resource that we have to use our opportunities given to us to afford those things.’” [WISN, [9/29/17](#)] (VIDEO)

**JOHNSON TOOK MORE THAN \$600,000 FROM THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY AND VOTED TO ALLOW THEM TO CHARGE PEOPLE MORE FOR HAVING PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS OR CHARGE OLDER AMERICANS MORE FOR THEIR CARE**

**JOHNSON TOOK MORE THAN \$600,000 FROM THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY**

**Johnson Received \$683,987 From The Insurance Industry Over His Political Career.** “According to Open Secrets, Ron Johnson received \$683,987 from the Insurance industry between 2009 and 2022.” [Open Secrets, [7/27/22](#)]

## JOHNSON VOTED TO LET THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY CHARGE PEOPLE WITH PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS MORE

**July 2017: Johnson Voted In Favor Of The Senate Motion To Proceed With The American Health Care Act.** On July 25, 2017 Johnson Voted In Favor Of The Motion To Proceed With The American Health Care Act. “On the Motion to Proceed (Motion to Proceed to H.R. 1628) A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.” The motion vote tied 50-50, the Vice President voted yea to break the tie. [CQ, [7/25/17](#), Senate Roll Call Vote, Vote 167, [7/25/17](#)]

- **Experts Predicted That The American Health Care Act’s Provisions That Allowed States To Seek Certain Waivers To Federal Requirements Would Result In Higher Premiums For People With Pre-Existing Conditions.** “But there’s often a difference between how things are described on paper and how they might work in practice. The waiver system designed under the AHCA was criticized by health-care experts. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office sketched a scenario that described unraveling insurance markets and spiraling health-care premiums if the AHCA had become law. The bill allowed states to waive community rating for people without continuous coverage,’ said Larry Levitt, senior vice president at the Kaiser Family Foundation. ‘People with preexisting conditions who had a gap in coverage would have been guaranteed insurance, but depending on what their state did, the premiums could have been astronomical. The bill also allowed states to alter the benefits insurers are required to cover, which could affect people with preexisting conditions who need certain types of services or medications. [...]The CBO was highly skeptical that the GOP legislation provided enough funding for states to offer assistance to people who could not afford insurance. ‘The funding would not be sufficient to substantially reduce the large increases in premiums for high-cost enrollees,’ the agency said, so over time, less-healthy people ‘would be unable to purchase comprehensive coverage with premiums close to those under current law and might not be able to purchase coverage at all.” [Washington Post, [9/19/18](#)]

### **Senator Ron Johnson Voted In Favor Of The Clean Repeal Of The Affordable Care Act..**

On July 26, 2017, Senator Ron Johnson Voted In Favor Of: “Enzi, R-Wyo., for Paul, R-Ky., amendment no. 271, to the McConnell, R-Ky., substitute amendment no. 267, that would sunset Medicaid expansion and certain taxes created under the 2010 health care overhaul, repeal the individual and employer mandates, would exclude health plans that cover abortion from certain tax credits and would ban federal funding for abortion providers that receive at least \$1 million in federal funding annually.” The amendment was rejected by a vote of 45-55. [CQ, [7/26/17](#); Vote 169, S.Amdt. 271 to S.Amdt. 267 to H.R. 1628, [7/26/17](#)]

### **July 2017: Johnson Voted For The Better Care Reconciliation Act, Which Would Repeal Most Of The ACA And Replace It.**

On July 25, 2017, Johnson voted for a, “Cruz, R-Texas, motion to waive applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act with respect to the Murray, D-Wash., point of order that McConnell, R-Ky., amendment no. 270, to McConnell substitute amendment no. 267, violates section 311(a)(2)(b) of the Congressional Budget Act. The McConnell amendment would repeal extensive provisions of the 2010 health care overhaul, including: the individual and employer mandates, the optional Medicaid expansion, subsidies given to individuals buying health insurance and some of the taxes that fund the law. It would create a health care tax credit based on income and age, and would authorize money to

stabilize the health care market and for high-risk individuals.” The measure failed by a vote of 43-57. [CQ, [7/25/17](#); S.Amdt 270 to HR 1628, Vote 168, [7/25/17](#)]

- **Vox: The Better Care Reconciliation Act Would Create Changes That “Could Be Costly For Older And Sicker Obamacare Enrollees Who Rely On The [Affordable Care Act] Law’s Current Requirements, And Who Would Be Asked To Pay More For Less Generous Coverage.”** “All in all, the replacement plan benefits people who are healthy and high-income, and disadvantages those who are sicker and lower-income. The [Better Care Reconciliation Act] replacement plan would make several changes to what health insurers can charge enrollees who purchase insurance on the individual market, as well as changing what benefits their plans must cover. In aggregate, these changes could be advantageous to younger and healthier enrollees who want skimpier (and cheaper) benefit packages. But they could be costly for older and sicker Obamacare enrollees who rely on the law’s current requirements, and would be asked to pay more for less generous coverage.” [Vox, [6/26/17](#)]

**July 2015: Senator Ron Johnson Voted In Favor Of A Measure To Advance An Amendment That Would Repeal The Affordable Care Act.** In July 2015 Senator Ron Johnson Voted In Favor Of A Measure to: “Motion to invoke cloture (thus limiting debate) on McConnell, R-Ky., amendment no. 2328 to the Kirk, R-Ill., amendment no. 2327, that would repeal the 2010 health care law. The Kirk amendment would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.” Motion was rejected 49-43. [CQ, 7/26/15; S.Amdt.2328 to S.Amdt.2327 to S.Amdt.2266 to HR 22, Vote 253, [7/26/15](#)]

### **JOHNSON VOTED TO LET THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY CHARGE OLDER AMERICANS MORE**

**Johnson Voted In Favor Of The Senate Motion To Proceed With The American Health Care Act.** On July 25, 2017 Johnson Voted In Favor Of The Motion To Proceed With The American Health Care Act. “On the Motion to Proceed (Motion to Proceed to H.R. 1628) A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.” The motion vote tied 50-50, the Vice President voted yea to break the tie. [CQ, [7/25/17](#), Senate Roll Call Vote, Vote 167, [7/25/17](#)]

- **Under AHCA Premiums For 60- To 64-Year-Olds Would Increase By An Average Of \$3,200.** “Significantly increasing premiums for older adults would only marginally lower costs for younger adults. The Joint Economic Committee paper incorrectly claims that weakening the limit on age rating to a 5-to-1 ratio would not penalize any age group. The burden of such a policy change would actually fall heavily on older adults, according to Milliman research commissioned by AARP. Under the AHCA: Average premiums would increase for all ages starting at about age 46. Premiums for 60- to 64-year-olds would increase by an average of \$3,200, amounting to average unsubsidized premiums of almost \$18,000 per year. Meanwhile, 20- to 29-year-olds are expected to see significantly smaller average savings, of only \$700 per year, giving them average unsubsidized premiums of \$4,010 per year.” [AARP, [5/4/17](#)]

**JOHNSON HAS CONTINUALLY SIDED WITH RICH DONORS THAT HELPED HIM INTO OFFICE OVER THE NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE OF WISCONSIN**

## JOHNSON WROTE A PROVISION THAT GAVE TAX BREAKS WORTH MILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR HIMSELF AND HIS WEALTHY SUPPORTERS

**PolitiFact Rated It True That “The Pass-Through Tax Break Johnson Advocated For In 2017 Overwhelmingly Benefited The Wealthiest, Over Small Businesses.”** “The Democratic Party of Wisconsin claimed that the pass-through tax break Johnson advocated for in 2017 ‘overwhelmingly benefited the wealthiest, over small businesses.’ Multiple analyses show America’s millionaires and billionaires are receiving large chunks of those benefits. We rate their claim True.” [Politifact, [6/7/22](#)]

## TWO OF HIS BIGGEST DONORS RECEIVED \$215 MILLION IN TAX DEDUCTIONS IN A SINGLE YEAR

**HEADLINE: Report: Johnson Pushed For Tax Break Benefitting Megadonors.** [Associated Press, [8/11/21](#)]

**In 2017, Johnson Blocked The Trump Tax Plan Until The Bill Included Sweetened Tax Breaks For Pass-Through Companies.** “In November 2017, with the administration of President Donald Trump rushing to get a massive tax overhaul through Congress, Sen. Ron Johnson stunned his colleagues by announcing he would vote ‘no.’ [...] Johnson’s demand was simple: In exchange for his vote, the bill must sweeten the tax break for a class of companies that are known as pass-throughs, since profits pass through to their owners. [...] Within two weeks, Johnson’s ultimatum produced results. Trump personally called the senator to beg for his support, and the bill’s authors fattened the tax cut for these businesses. Johnson flipped to a ‘yes’ and claimed credit for the change. The bill passed.” [ProPublica, [8/11/21](#)]

- **Johnson Advocated For Pass-Through Companies To Be Able To Deduct 20% Of Their Profits Rather Than The 17.4% Established In The Original Bill.** “Johnson’s intervention in November 2017 was designed to boost the bill’s already generous tax break for pass-through companies. The bill had allowed for business owners to deduct up to 17.4% of their profits. Thanks to Johnson holding out, that figure was ultimately boosted to 20%. That might seem like a small increase, but even a few extra percentage points can translate into tens of millions of dollars in extra deductions in one year alone for an ultrawealthy family. The mechanics are complicated but, for the rich, it generally means that a business owner gets to keep an extra 7 cents on every dollar of profit.” [ProPublica, [8/11/21](#)]

**Johnson Switched From An Opponent Of The Bill To A Supporter After Getting The More Generous Tax Cuts.** “Republican U.S. Sen. Ron Johnson of Wisconsin pushed for a tax break in 2017 resulting in hundreds of millions of dollars in deductions to megadonors who funded his campaigns, a report Wednesday from the nonprofit investigative journalism organization ProPublica found. Johnson switched from an opponent of the massive Trump tax cut bill to a supporter after getting the more generous tax cuts that resulted in more than \$79 million in tax savings for two of his largest donors in 2018 alone.” [Associated Press, [8/11/21](#)]

**Confidential Tax Records Showed That Johnson’s Last Minute Push For Greater Tax Benefits For Pass-Through Companies Netted Two Families Who Were Among Johnson’s Biggest Donors \$215 Million In Deductions In 2018 Alone.** “Confidential tax records, however, reveal that Johnson’s last-minute maneuver benefited two families more than almost any others in the country — both worth billions and both among the senator’s biggest

donors. Dick and Liz Uihlein of packaging giant Uline, along with roofing magnate Diane Hendricks, together had contributed around \$20 million to groups backing Johnson's 2016 reelection campaign. The expanded tax break Johnson muscled through netted them \$215 million in deductions in 2018 alone, drastically reducing the income they owed taxes on. At that rate, the cut could deliver more than half a billion in tax savings for Hendricks and the Uihleins over its eight-year life." [ProPublica, [8/11/21](#)]

- **In 2018 Alone, Johnson's Two Largest Donors Received More Than \$79 Million In Tax Savings From The Expanded Deductions.** "Republican U.S. Sen. Ron Johnson of Wisconsin pushed for a tax break in 2017 resulting in hundreds of millions of dollars in deductions to megadonors who funded his campaigns, a report Wednesday from the nonprofit investigative journalism organization ProPublica found. Johnson switched from an opponent of the massive Trump tax cut bill to a supporter after getting the more generous tax cuts that resulted in more than \$79 million in tax savings for two of his largest donors in 2018 alone." [Associated Press, [8/11/21](#)]

## JOHNSON PERSONALLY BENEFITED FROM THE TAX BREAKS

**HEADLINE: "Republican Senator 'Personally Benefited From Tax Change He Sought'."**  
[The Guardian, [10/21/20](#)]

**Johnson Conceded That He Personally Benefited From The Tax Provision He Added Into The Republican Tax Plan, As Did Several Of His Top Donors.** "For months, Democrats and their allies have claimed that Republican U.S. Sen. Ron Johnson and some of his top donors benefited from a key provision he pushed for in President Donald Trump's signature 2017 tax bill. During a meeting with GOP supporters Friday in Medford, Johnson was asked by an audience member how they should respond to an ad attacking the senator for his wealth and support for the measure. Johnson acknowledged the Oshkosh-based plastics business he owned, Pacur LLC, benefited from the small-business tax provision, as did some of his prominent donors. [...] 'Now, did my business benefit? Sure. Did some of my donor businesses? Sure. When you give tax relief to everybody, everybody benefits,' Johnson said." [Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, [4/11/22](#)]

- **Johnson: "Now, Did My Business Benefit? Sure. Did Some Of My Donor Businesses? Sure."** "During a meeting with GOP supporters Friday in Medford, Johnson was asked by an audience member how they should respond to an ad attacking the senator for his wealth and support for the measure. Johnson acknowledged the Oshkosh-based plastics business he owned, Pacur LLC, benefited from the small-business tax provision, as did some of his prominent donors. [...] 'Now, did my business benefit? Sure. Did some of my donor businesses? Sure. When you give tax relief to everybody, everybody benefits,' Johnson said." [Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, [4/11/22](#)] (AUDIO)

**The Pass-Through Tax Break Johnson Secured In The Trump Tax Bill Increased The Value Of Pass-Through Companies.** "Four months earlier [to beginning negotiations for the Pacur sale], Johnson became the first Republican senator to announce that he would vote against Trump's tax bill if it did not give better treatment to so-called 'pass-through' entities, or companies that are taxed at rates for individual taxpayers but whose profits are distributed to owners. Johnson's threat paid off and a change to improve the tax rate for pass-throughs was

added to the law, which Johnson supported. The change was recognized at the time as increasing the value of pass-through entities.” [The Guardian, [10/21/20](#)]

**Johnson Earned As Much As \$25 Million In Profits From Selling Pacur, A Pass-Through Company, In March 2020 – A Much Higher Figure Than The \$1 - \$5 Million Johnson Reported His Stake In The Company As Being Worth In 2017.** “Johnson sold his stock in his own pass-through company, Pacur, a plastics company he previously ran with his brother-in-law, on 2 March 2020, generating profits of as much as \$25m on the sale. In 2017, Johnson said his stake was worth between \$1m and \$5m.” [The Guardian, [10/21/20](#)]

**On Senate Disclosure Forms, Johnson Reported Between \$5,000,001 - \$25,000,000 In Earnings From The Sale Of Pacur.** [U.S. Senate Financial Disclosures, [03/02/20](#)]

**JOHNSON’S PERSONAL WEALTH HAD DOUBLED, MAKING HIM THE 5<sup>TH</sup> RICHEST SENATOR**

**JOHNSON’S NET WORTH DOUBLED**

<b>JOHNSON NET WORTH WHILE IN OFFICE</b>			
	<b>MIN</b>	<b>MAX</b>	<b>AVERAGE</b>
<b>CY 2011</b>	\$8,717,015	\$38,642,213	\$23,679,614
<b>CY 2012</b>	\$9,266,015	\$39,766,001	\$24,516,008
<b>CY 2013</b>	\$13,266,013	\$59,665,000	\$36,465,507
<b>CY 2014</b>	\$13,351,012	\$59,866,001	\$36,608,507
<b>CY 2015</b>	\$13,401,014	\$59,965,000	\$36,683,007
<b>CY 2016</b>	\$10,351,014	\$44,865,000	\$27,608,007
<b>CY 2017</b>	\$10,101,014	\$44,365,000	\$27,233,007
<b>CY 2018</b>	\$14,101,014	\$64,366,000	\$39,233,507
<b>CY 2019</b>	\$18,101,013	\$84,366,000	\$51,233,506.50

[Johnson Personal Financial Disclosure Report – 2020, filed [5/17/21](#); Johnson Personal Financial Disclosure Report – 2019, filed [8/06/20](#); Johnson Personal Financial Disclosure Report – 2018, filed [5/15/19](#); Johnson Personal Financial Disclosure Report – 2017, filed [5/15/18](#); Johnson Personal Financial Disclosure Report – 2016, filed [5/15/17](#); Johnson Personal Financial Disclosure Report – 2015, filed [5/12/16](#); Johnson Personal Financial Disclosure Report - 2014, Filed [5/14/15](#); Johnson Personal Financial Disclosure Report - 2013, Filed [5/15/14](#); Johnson Personal Financial Disclosure Report - 2012, Filed [6/4/13](#); Johnson Personal Financial Disclosure Report - 2011 (Amended), Filed [9/14/12](#)]

**JOHNSON IS THE 5<sup>TH</sup> RICHEST SENATOR**

**In CY2019, Johnson Became The 5<sup>th</sup> Richest Senator In Washington, Rising From Being Only The 11<sup>th</sup> Richest In CY2011.** [Senate.gov, CY2019 Financial Disclosures, accessed [08/19/22](#)]

- **OpenSecrets: In 2011, Ron Johnson Was The 11<sup>th</sup> Richest Senator In The U.S. Congress.** [OpenSecrets, Ron Johnson Personal Finances, accessed [6/23/22](#)]

RICHEST SENATORS IN CY2019								
RANK	SENATOR	ASSETS		LIABILITIES		NET WORTH		
		MIN	MAX	MIN	MAX	MIN	MAX	AVERAGE
1	MARK WARNER	\$90,055,092	\$411,844,000	\$0	\$0	\$90,055,092	\$411,844,000	\$250,949,546
2	MITT ROMNEY	\$88,450,099	\$324,010,000	\$1,530,003	\$2,100,000	\$86,350,099	\$322,479,997	\$204,415,048
3	RICK SCOTT	\$77,934,068	\$272,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$77,934,068	\$272,000,000	\$174,967,034
4	DIANNE FEINSTEIN	\$63,999,050	\$165,222,000	\$4,000,001	\$8,000,000	\$55,999,050	\$161,221,999	\$108,610,525
5	<b>RON JOHNSON</b>	<b>\$18,101,013</b>	<b>\$84,366,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$18,101,013</b>	<b>\$84,366,000</b>	<b>\$51,233,507</b>
6	JOHN HOEVEN	\$19,529,109	\$73,407,000	\$0	\$0	\$19,529,109	\$73,407,000	\$46,468,055
7	JAMES E. RISCH	\$15,874,054	\$68,338,000	\$0	\$0	\$15,874,054	\$68,338,000	\$42,106,027
8	RICHARD BLUMENTHAL	\$29,854,106	\$55,292,000	\$500,001	\$1,000,000	\$28,854,106	\$54,791,999	\$41,823,053
9	MITCH MCCONNELL	\$14,410,066	\$55,780,005	\$0	\$0	\$14,410,066	\$55,780,005	\$35,095,036
10	MIKE BRAUN	\$7,962,071	\$29,045,015	\$50,001	\$100,000	\$7,862,071	\$28,995,015	\$18,428,543
11	ROB PORTMAN	\$7,349,090	\$22,442,007	\$700,004	\$1,500,000	\$5,849,090	\$21,742,003	\$13,795,547

[Senate.gov, CY2019 Financial Disclosures, accessed [08/19/22](#)]

**JOHNSON EXPRESSED SUPPORT FOR A PLAN TO HIKE TAXES ON MIDDLE AND WORKING CLASS WISCONSINITES**

**JOHNSON PRAISED RICK SCOTT AND SAID HE SUPPORTED “MOST” OF HIS PLAN**

**Johnson Said “I Certainly Support Senator Scott. He’s A Real Ally...Do I Agree With Everything On It? Most Of It.”** [Breitbart News Daily, [3/07/22](#)] (AUDIO)

**SCOTT PLAN WOULD RISE TAXES ON MIDDLE AND WORKING CLASS WISCONSINITES**

**Scott Plan Would Raise Taxes On 32 Percent Of Wisconsinites.** According to the Institute of Taxation and Economic, the Scott plan would raise taxes on 32 percent of Wisconsinites. [Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, [3/07/22](#)]

- **ITEP: Tax Increase In Scott Plan “Would Be Paid By The Poorest 40 Percent Of Americans...The Next Fifth Of Americans Would Pay 45 Percent Of The Tax Increase.”** “As illustrated in Figure 1, most of the resulting tax increase in the United States would be paid by the poorest 40 percent of Americans. The poorest fifth of Americans would pay 34 percent of the tax increase while the next fifth of Americans

would pay 45 percent of the tax increase.” [Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, [3/07/22](#)]

## **JOHNSON SUPPORTS ALLOWING WISCONSIN TO BAN ABORTION IN CASES OF RAPE AND INCEST**

### **JOHNSON CELEBRATED THE SUPREME COURT DECISION TO OVERTURN ROE V. WADE**

**Johnson: “I Obviously Confirmed The Justices That Handed Down That Correct Decision [That Overturned Roe V. Wade.]** “I’m fully supportive of what the Supreme Court did. I obviously confirmed the justices that handed down that correct decision to turn this 50-year debate that didn’t solve anything, it just exacerbated the divide this country, over to the states. And, Brian, here’s the question that we need to decide as a society, state by state. At what point does society have the responsibility to protect life?” [Fox News, Brian Kilmeade Show, [7/13/22](#)] (AUDIO)

**Johnson On Overturning Roe V Wade: “Today Is A Victory For Life And For Those Who Have Fought For Decades To Protect The Unborn. For Almost 50 Years The Decision Of Nine Unelected Justices Prevented A Democratically Derived Consensus On The Profound Moral Issue Of Abortion. Now The Debate Can Be Returned To States.”** “Today is a victory for life and for those who have fought for decades to protect the unborn. For almost 50 years the decision of nine unelected Justices prevented a democratically derived consensus on the profound moral issue of abortion. Now the debate can be returned to states. This decision will now allow that democratic process to unfold in each state to determine at what point does society have the responsibility to protect life. Hopefully, the debate will be conducted with sincerity, compassion, and respect for the broad range of views that people hold.” [Twitter, @senronjohnson, [6/24/22](#)]

**Johnson Praised The “Beauty” Of Overturning Roe V. Wade, Which He Described As Allowing For A Discussion On The Issue Of Abortion.** “RON JOHNSON: I think the beauty of overturning Roe V. Wade is we delayed the discussion on this profound moral issue that Judge Alito [mumbling.] We delayed that discussion for fifty years. I was hoping we could move forward now, with a very sympathetic, very compassionate discussion and debate on this issue that takes into account the full range of people’s beliefs on this.” [Sandy Rios In The Morning, [7/21/22](#)] (AUDIO)

### **JOHNSON BELIEVES STATES SHOULD BE ABLE TO BAN ABORTIONS WITHOUT EXCEPTIONS FOR RAPE, INCEST, OR THE LIFE OF THE MOTHER**

**Johnson Suggested States Should Be Allowed To Make Their Own Decisions On Abortion – Regardless Of How Strict They Were—And Said People “Can Move” If They Disliked Their State’s Law.** “Wisconsin Republican U.S. Sen. Ron Johnson said Saturday he doesn’t support a federal law mirroring Alabama’s effort to ban most abortions. Johnson has proposed a nationwide ban on abortions 20 weeks after fertilization, which would be in line with Wisconsin law. The Supreme Court’s 1973 Roe v. Wade ruling legalized abortion nationwide until a fetus is developed enough to survive outside a woman’s uterus. Johnson said he wishes the court had never ruled on abortion. ‘We should have let that process play out democratically state by state,’ Johnson told reporters at the Wisconsin Republican Party convention. ‘The fact of the matter is, you allow it that way, if you don’t like the result in the state you currently reside,

you can move. You have that freedom in America, which is a good thing.' Johnson said he would not support a nationwide law similar to Alabama's, which makes performing an abortion a felony in nearly all cases and contains no exceptions for cases of rape or incest. Kentucky, Mississippi, Ohio and Georgia recently approved bans on abortion once a fetal heartbeat is detected, which can occur in about the sixth week of pregnancy. Missouri's Republican-led Senate voted early Thursday to ban abortions at eight weeks, with no rape or incest exceptions. Louisiana lawmakers have been speeding toward passing a six-week ban." [Associated Press, [5/18/19](#)]

**Johnson Said He Supported Abortion In The Case Of "Rape, Incest, Or The Life Of The Mother," But Did Not Call On The Wisconsin Legislature To Repeal Or Amend The 1849 Law Banning Most Abortions In The State.** "Republican U.S. Sen. Ron Johnson said Saturday that he supports 'exceptions to abortion restrictions in the case of rape, incest, or the life of the mother' but did not call on the state Legislature to amend Wisconsin's 1849 law that bans most abortions. Johnson, who is running for a third term in November, laid out his stance on abortion and contraception in a lengthy statement posted to his campaign website." [Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, [7/23/22](#)]

**Just The Truth: Johnson Said He Believed "Life Begins At The Moment Of Conception, But I Fully Support Allowing The Democratic Process In Each State To Decide At What Point Society Should Protect That Life."** "I believe society has a responsibility to protect life at some point in the womb. As a U.S. Senator, I have voted in favor of protecting life after 20 weeks (5 months). I also signed an amicus brief supporting Dobbs in overturning Roe, and also in protecting life after 15 weeks (~4 months). I personally believe life begins at the moment of conception, but I fully support allowing the democratic process in each state to decide at what point society should protect that life. This is the profound moral question that must weigh the interests and rights of the mother against the interests and rights of the unborn child within her." [Just the Truth, [7/23/22](#)]

**JOHNSON EVEN HELPED WRITE A BILL THAT WOULD BAN SOME ABORTIONS NATIONWIDE WHILE PUNISHING DOCTORS WHO PERFORM ABORTIONS WITH JAIL TIME**

**Johnson Was An Original Cosponsor The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, Which Established A Criminal Offense, Which Could Include Prison Time, For Performing An Abortion At 20 Weeks Or More.** Ron Johnson was an original cosponsor of the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, that "establishes a new criminal offense for performing or attempting to perform an abortion if the probable post-fertilization age of the fetus is 20 weeks or more. A violator is subject to criminal penalties—a fine, a prison term of up to five years, or both. The bill provides exceptions for an abortion (1) that is necessary to save the life of the pregnant woman, or (2) when the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest. A physician who performs or attempts to perform an abortion under an exception must comply with specified requirements. A woman who undergoes a prohibited abortion may not be prosecuted for violating or conspiring to violate the provisions of this bill." [S.61, Introduced [1/27/21](#)]

**Johnson: "I've Signed On To A National Bill That Would Have Banned Abortions After 20 Weeks. I Mean, I Think That's A Pretty Reasonable Accommodation."** RON JOHNSON: "I've signed on to a national bill that would have banned abortions after 20 weeks." [Spicer & Co, Newsmax, [5/3/22](#)](VIDEO)

**JOHNSON EVEN HELPED WRITE A BILL THAT WOULD BAN SOME ABORTIONS NATIONWIDE WHILE PUNISHING DOCTORS WHO PERFORM ABORTIONS WITH JAIL TIME**

**Johnson Was An Original Cosponsor The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, Which Established A Criminal Offense, Which Could Include Prison Time, For Performing An Abortion At 20 Weeks Or More.** Ron Johnson was an original cosponsor of the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, that “establishes a new criminal offense for performing or attempting to perform an abortion if the probable post-fertilization age of the fetus is 20 weeks or more. A violator is subject to criminal penalties—a fine, a prison term of up to five years, or both. The bill provides exceptions for an abortion (1) that is necessary to save the life of the pregnant woman, or (2) when the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest. A physician who performs or attempts to perform an abortion under an exception must comply with specified requirements. A woman who undergoes a prohibited abortion may not be prosecuted for violating or conspiring to violate the provisions of this bill.” [S.61, Introduced [1/27/21](#)]

**JOHNSON SAID IF PEOPLE DON'T LIKE ABORTION LAWS “YOU CAN MOVE”**

**Johnson On Abortion: “We Should Have Let That Process Play Out Democratically State By State...If You Don't Like The Result In The State You Currently Reside In, You Can Move.”** “We should have let that process play out democratically state by state,” Johnson told reporters at the Wisconsin Republican Party convention. “The fact of the matter is, you allow it that way, if you don't like the result in the state you currently reside, you can move. You have that freedom in America, which is a good thing.” [Associated Press, [5/18/19](#)]

**JOHNSON SAID SINGLE MOMS STRUGGLING TO MAKE ENDS MEET COULD WORK IN DAYCARE TOGETHER**

**Johnson Said, “Let Single Moms Actually Work In Day Care To Support Each Other.”** “Johnson made the remarks on day care centers in a Wisconsin radio interview on Monday. He didn't clarify his comments, putting his handlers in the position of scrambling to understand, and then explain, what their boss meant. [...] Johnson made the remarks on day care centers in a Wisconsin radio interview on Monday. He didn't clarify his comments, putting his handlers in the position of scrambling to understand, and then explain, what their boss meant. [...] ‘Let single moms actually work in day care to support each other,’ Johnson said. ‘We have prohibitions against that, providing day care for a facility that has your own children in it. I think we need to review some of these policies.’ [...] Day care centers that accept state subsidies face different state rules than those that do not. The law for those accepting state payments was tightened in 2009 after an investigation by the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel revealed that some day care providers were collecting subsidies while watching each other's kids. Wisconsin law now prohibits subsidy payments to a certified child care provider where an employee's child is getting services. Caregivers watching up to three children in their own home are not regulated.” [Associated Press, [8/30/16](#)] ([AUDIO](#))